

REMARKS

The Office action has been carefully considered. The Office action rejected claims 1-7 and 9-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,359,572 to Vale et al. ("Vale") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,552,719 to Lui et al. ("Lui"). Further, the Office action also rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale in view of Lui and in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0085038 to Cobbley et al. ("Cobbley"). The Office action objected to claims 3, 6, and 13 for informalities and improper dependent form. Additionally, the Office action objected to the drawings for various informalities as well.

By present amendment, claims 3 and 13 have been amended for clarification to obviate the Office action objections for informality and improper dependent form, and not in view of the prior art. Further, various paragraphs of the specification have been amended to obviate the objections to the drawings detailed by the Office action. Applicants submit that the claims as filed were patentable over the prior art of record, and that the amendments herein are for purposes of clarifying the claims and/or for expediting allowance of the claims and not for reasons related to patentability. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview held (by telephone) on January 28, 2004. During the interview, the Examiner and applicants' attorney discussed the claims with respect to the prior art. The essence of applicants' position is incorporated in the remarks below.

Objections to the Drawings

Applicants have amended various paragraphs in the specification to include the reference numbers 800 and 902 and to remove the reference number 212.

Regarding the Office action request that FIGS. 1 and 2 be amended to include the words "Prior Art", applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants submit that FIGS. 1 and 2 do not show only that which is old. Specifically, FIG. 1 is a block diagram representing a computer system *into which the present invention may be incorporated* and FIG. 2 is a block diagram representing an input method manager communicating with an application for selection of an input method *in accordance with an aspect of the present invention*. Accordingly, amending the drawings to include the indication "Prior Art" would not be appropriate. Applicants submit that the drawings, as filed, are in proper condition and need not be amended.

103(a) Obviousness Rejections

The Office action has rejected claims 1-7 and 9-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale in view of Lui. Although the Office action does not state upon which provision of 35 U.S.C. §102 these references are considered prior art, because the publication and/or issue dates of these U.S. Patents are after the filing date of the present application, the only provision that these references may be considered prior art is under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(c):

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

As set forth in the attached STATEMENT TO ESTABLISH COMMON OWNERSHIP, applicants submit that the current application and the patents of Vale and Lui were, at the time the invention of the present application was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same entity. Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), applicants request that Vale and Lui be withdrawn as a reference for all § 103 rejections, including claims 1-24.

Applicants note that the present application was filed on October 12, 2001. For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, a 102(e) prior art reference may not be applied in an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 if the patent and the pending application are commonly assigned or subject to an obligation of assignment at the time the claimed invention was made. See MPEP 706.02(k). For at least this reason, claims 1-7 and 9-24 are patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vale in view of Cobbley. Applicants respectfully disagree. As shown above, Vale was a commonly owned or subject to assignment to the same entity at the time the present invention was made and, therefore, should be withdrawn from the prior art of record. Further, applicants submit that claim 8 is ultimately dependent

from claim 1 and is allowable over the prior art of record for additional patentable reasons other than reasons why claim 1 is allowable.


For at least these reasons, applicants submit that all the claims are patentable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in the Office Action is respectfully requested and early allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and that the application is good and proper form for allowance. A favorable action on the part of the Examiner is earnestly solicited.

If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (425) 836-3030.

Respectfully submitted,




Albert S. Michalik, Reg. No. 37,395
Attorney for Applicants
Law Offices of Albert S. Michalik, PLLC
704 - 228th Avenue NE, Suite 193
Sammamish, WA 98074
(425) 836-3030
(425) 836-8957 (facsimile)

STATEMENT TO ESTABLISH COMMON OWNERSHIP

(Regarding U.S. Patent No. 6,359,572 and U.S. Patent No. 6,552,719)

Applicants, through the attorney of record, state that the present application and each of the above-identified references were, at the time the invention was made, owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same entity.

Respectfully submitted,



Albert S. Michalik, Reg. No. 37,395
Attorney for Applicants
Law Offices of Albert S. Michalik, PLLC
704 - 228th Avenue NE, Suite 193
Sammamish, WA 98074
(425) 836-3030
(425) 836-8957 (facsimile)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this Amendment and Petition for Extension of Time, along with Transmittal, are being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date:

April 9, 2004

Albert S. Michalik

Albert S. Michalik

2980 Amendment